1	All right. I have the index of
2	hearing exhibits. That's not the one I want.
3	Just a moment please. I'm sorry.
4	Here it is. Hearing exhibits and
5	written testimony of Comcast Cable
6	Communications, LLC. Let me go through these
7	first.
8	We have, you know, discussed
9	objections and potential objections, and we've
10	established rules this morning. There are
11	Exhibit Nos. 1 through 288. Are there any
12	specific exhibits that we have to look at now
13	or can I just receive them all?
14	MR. SCHMIDT: Other than the
15	depositions that we spoke about this morning,
16	which I think are out, nothing, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well,
18	what are we going to do with the depositions?
19	MR. SCHMIDT: It's our view that
20	they just shouldn't be part of I don't
21	think it's a big point of contention.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah. Well, I

1	understand why you gave them to me in that
2	case.
3	MR. CARROLL: If you want us to
4	pull them out
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah.
6	MR. CARROLL: I don't have any
7	problem doing that.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Why don't we do
9	that? Okay?
10	MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: But, you know, you
12	can leave me, leave on the table, or whoever
13	handles it, you can leave me what's you
14	don't have to take them back. You can just
15	leave them. What you take out you can leave
16	here
17	MR. CARROLL: Sure.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: in case there's
19	a reason to refer to it while there's an
20	examination. You know, invariably, a witness
21	might say, "Well, I said it there, but I
22	didn't say it." So you have to go look.

1	So that will make sense and so we
2	won't clutter up the record with a whole
3	what numbers would those be? Can you tell me
4	that?
5	MR. SCHMIDT: I think it's at
6	least Exhibit 3, 17, 21.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Three, 17.
8	MR. SCHMIDT: Twenty-one.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Twenty-one.
10	MR. SCHMIDT: Twenty-five.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Twenty-five.
12	MR. SCHMIDT: Thirty-two.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thirty-two.
14	MR. SCHMIDT: Sixty-five.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sixty-five.
16	MR. SCHMIDT: Sixty-six.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sixty-six.
18	MR. SCHMIDT: Sixty-seven.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Sixty-seven.
20	MR. SCHMIDT: Eighty-one.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Eighty-one.
22	MR. SCHMIDT: Ninety-four.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Nine, four.
2	MR. SCHMIDT: Ninety-five.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Nine, five.
4	MR. SCHMIDT: Ninety-seven.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Nine, seven.
6	MR. SCHMIDT: Ninety-eight and 99.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Ninety-eight, 99.
8	MR. SCHMIDT: One hundred and
9	nine.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: One, oh, nine.
11	MR. SCHMIDT: One hundred and
12	ninety-nine.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: One, ninety-nine.
14	MR. SCHMIDT: Two hundred.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Two hundred.
16	MR. SCHMIDT: And two, oh, one.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Two, oh, one.
18	MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, sir.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. And are
20	the specific parts of those exhibits
21	identified as the ones that you're relying on
22	so that they could be separated?

1	MR. CARROLL: We have done a
2	separate designation of the testimony that
3	we're offering that has counter-designations.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, okay.
5	Well, I'll leave these all here, and somebody
6	can stay and figure out a way to pull them
7	out. The only thing I'm interested in is that
8	which is offered as direct testimony, and then
9	we'll see where we go from there.
10	Anything else? Mr. Carroll?
11	MR. CARROLL: Not on our exhibit
12	list that I know of.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Nothing from the
14	other side?
15	MR. SCHMIDT: Not that we haven't
16	raised, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Then
18	subject to the previous rulings and this
19	ruling today, Comcast Exhibit Nos. 1 through
20	288 are received in evidence, and the reporter
21	will or the reporting company will stamp each
22	individually as identified and received in

1	evidence today, 13 April 2009.
2	(Whereupon, the documents referred
3	to were marked as Comcast Exhibit
4	Nos. 1 through 288 for
5	identification and were received
6	in evidence.)
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's it. Is
8	there anything else?
9	MR. CARROLL: Deposition
10	designations. Each side has designated
11	objected counter-designated. Let me see if
12	this is right. I don't know that we have a
13	need to hash through any of those at this
14	point unless my colleagues on the other side
15	feel differently.
16	MR. SCHMIDT: No, that's exactly
17	our view. Your Honor, there is one category
18	of deposition designations that is not
19	complete. So we think it makes sense to
20	complete that part of it and defer it to the
21	first trial proceeding because I don't think

it's something we're going to be putting in

1	evidence formally during the trial. It would
2	be something that would go to Your Honor as
3	Your Honor makes the determination.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, the evidence
5	has to come in before they close the record on
6	the trial phase. So it has to be an effort to
7	straighten that out between now and whenever
8	we close the record.
9	MR. SCHMIDT: We would agree with
10	that, Your Honor. We would just think there
11	would be a short period after before we close
12	the record where we cab
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's fine.
14	That's very reasonable.
15	Now, you mentioned there's a
1 -	
16	pending discovery motion or there's something
17	pending discovery motion or there's something pending.
17	pending.
17 18	pending. MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor.
17 18 19	pending. MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: What exactly is

to compel, and then Comcast responded with a motion to compel. Our motion to compel went to some of these affiliation agreements we've been talking about that Comcast has entered into, and then Comcast filed a motion to compel on some of the topics that Your Honor heard about this morning.

I think it's our position at that point, at this point, given that we're the day before trial, that they're effectively moot because there is no way we could comply if we were ordered to produce documents before the hearing. I suspect there's no way Comcast could comply if they were ordered to produce documents before the hearing, and we just have to proceed with the record that we can.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Carroll?

MR. CARROLL: Your Honor, I agree that there's nothing that can be done today that would involve production this week on either of those motions. I think whether they're moot or not should be a determination

that's made at the end of the evidence this 1 week because Your Honor could decide that 2 there's some aspect of this case that you'd 3 like to hear more on if the record was not 4 complete and that it's covered by one of those 5 motions, and I wouldn't want to prejudge Your 6 7 Honor's ability to make that decision at the end of the week. 8 9 But we agree as a practical matter today it makes no sense for either one of us 10 to be trying to scramble, in addition to 11 12 everything else we're doing, and be producing 13 documents at the same time we're trying the 14 case. 15 JUDGE SIPPEL: Let me ask you What date were these motions? 16 this. Were 17 they cross-filed? Were they all 18 simultaneously or were they different dates? 19 MR. CARROLL: No. 20 MR. CARROLL: Ours was March 10th. 21 MR. SCHMIDT: And ours was about 22 the week before.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: March 10? Comcast
2	motion, and how about Enterprise?
3	MR. SCHMIDT: I don't have our
4	date with me.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
6	MR. SCHMIDT: It was a few days
7	before Comcast.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Was it the first
9	one or was it after Comcast?
10	MR. SCHMIDT: It was before
11	theirs.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
13	MR. SCHMIDT: It was a couple days
14	before.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
16	MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Toscano might be
17	helping me out here.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: I can dig those up,
19	and was
20	MR. TOSCANO: Enterprises' motion
21	was dated March 3rd, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.

1	And was it replies and sur-
2	replies?
3	MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, sir.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I will dig
5	those out and see what this is, more to
6	educate myself as to more what this is about
7	now. Of course, I'm familiar with the general
8	issue that you're talking about.
9	Let me ask this question then.
10	What about the let's see. Those are
11	affiliations. I guess that would be is
12	there anything else pending beside those?
13	MR. CARROLL: Yes, Your Honor.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Being what?
15	MR. CARROLL: We have the motion
16	for judicial estoppel.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I want to ask
18	about that, yes. Thank you.
19	MR. CARROLL: Okay.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: There's no reason
21	that has to be decided this week. That can
22	wait, can't it?

1	MR. CARROLL: I think as a
2	practical matter where we are it makes perfect
3	sense for Your Honor to listen to the evidence
4	this week. I think, Your Honor, we'll need to
5	make a I don't think that will ever become
6	moot sa compared to discovery because it gets
7	to issues as to whether they can take a
8	different position here than one they've taken
9	in New York principally on remedies that they
10	want, but I think there's no reason that you
11	would have to decide that before the hearing
12	starts.
13	It would have been useful
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah.
15	MR. CARROLL: because it would
16	have given us a sense for the scope of some of
17	the issues we have to deal with here or not,
18	but given where we are, I think it's fine for
19	Your Honor to decide that in conjunction with
20	or after this hearing, but I do think that
21	motion does not go away.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, okay. I just

1	wanted to know. What I do when I'm having
2	obviously what I'm dealing with is an
3	allotment of time for myself. I will address
4	that certainly as readily as I can. I agree
5	I'd like to hear some of the testimony before
6	I go into that, and also I believe that there
7	are replies and sur-replies outstanding; isn't
8	that correct?
9	MR. CARROLL: It's fully briefed.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is fully briefed
11	all the way?
12	MR. CARROLL: Yes, it's fully
13	briefed.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I'm running
15	out of excuses. All right.
16	MR. CARROLL: No, Your Honor.
17	With all of this paper, you don't need any
18	excuses in this case.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, anyway, what
20	I will do is I can see the relevance of it,
21	and you'll get a decision certainly, and I
22	really do want the time on that one now.

1	MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, Your
2	Honor.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: The other,
4	hopefully, that I can come to grips with.
5	Now, the other question was,
6	however, that there was something about this
7	morning about whether or not somebody had not
8	been asked questions on deposition. Are there
9	anymore depositions that are absolutely
10	necessary?
11	MR. SCHMIDT: No, Your Honor.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: No?
13	MR. SCHMIDT: No.
14	MR. CARROLL: No. I think that
15	the depositions have been taken unless no
16	my team is giving me the affirmative.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I know in
18	general they've been taken, but I mean is
19	there anything? If there's anything that
20	really is very, very well, for example,
21	these new agreements, I'm curious about where
22	they come out. I understand the explanation

1	as to relevance on both sides of this, but to
2	understand the whole picture here, I'm
3	inclined to want to hear something about
4	those.
5	MR. CARROLL: Well, Your Honor, my
6	adversary mentioned this morning that there's
7	an agreement they're going to be giving us
8	later today that we have not received.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's correct. I
10	remember that.
11	MR. CARROLL: And so I'll look
12	forward to seeing that. I'm prepared at this
13	juncture to they start their case tomorrow
14	morning.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Correct.
16	MR. CARROLL: They've got their
17	witnesses on. I expect I'm going to have some
18	questions I may have some questions about
19	some of their witnesses about those most
20	recent agreements, and Your Honor will have a
21	chance then to appreciate fully the relevance

of it and how it fits in.

1	I think that's not going to go
2	away. I think that information is relevant
3	certainly to the notion of any remedy that
4	would ever be awarded on the issue of it
5	there's no discrimination and we never get
6	past that issue, then I think you could make
7	an argument we really wouldn't need to worry
8	about those recent agreements.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
10	MR. CARROLL: But those recent
11	agreements purport to be agreements with
12	others in the marketplace that have provisions
13	in them with respect to price and distribution
14	that it would seem would be relevant if you're
15	going to get into looking at those issues.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm going to
17	have to take the evidence just from the time
18	standpoint. I've got to take the evidence on
19	remedy.
20	MR. CARROLL: Yes.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't know. I'm
22	not going to be in the position to I don't

think that I'm not guite that guick -- I'm 1 2 going to have to look at the record before I 3 can make the cut on what you're 4 although that's within the rea1m of 5 possibility. 6 Enterprise, anything to add to 7 that or subtract from that? MR. SCHMIDT: No. It's our view 8 9 that discovery is done. Comcast has been 10 taking that view with respect to matters in 11 the FCC for some period. We've given them the 12 new documents as they have become available to 13 They're pretty straightforward documents us. 14 that are clear on their face where they can sit down and look at them and figure out what 15 16 they say. 17

And as Mr. Carroll indicated, if they want to ask their expert about them and whether they affect his opinions, they can do that. If they want to incorporate them into their own experts' opinions, that's also something they could do.

18

19

20

21

1	But in our view the record is what
2	it is. We, frankly, thought the record was
3	closed before this most recent Echo Star
4	agreement was signed. Because we wanted to be
5	in a position where we had given them
6	everything, we gave them that agreement.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, as I say,
8	it's hard to close the record on a moving
9	target, in a sense, and we certainly can't
10	leave any wrinkles out there that haven't been
11	addressed, regardless of how relevant they end
12	up being.
13	How about the Bureau? Mr.
14	Schonman, anything?
15	MR. SCHONMAN: No, sir, nothing to
16	add.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Is it Mr.
18	Tagliabue we start with in the morning?
19	MR. SCHMIDT: Now, we wanted to
20	address that, Your Honor.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.

start with, and we've spoken with Mr. Carroll about this on the break, is we have four witnesses. We have Frank Hawkins, who we intend to offer as our first witness. We have Hal Singer, our economist. We intend to offer Dr. Singer as our second witness.

We have Ron Furman, who we intend to offer as our third witness, and then Mr. Tagliabue has scheduling difficulties. We have reached an agreement with the other side where he will be offered on the 16th, this Thursday, subject to Comcast being able to call Mr. Roberts, their witness, after Mr. Tagliabue, which we have agreed to.

We also agreed that before today's proceedings we disclosed our witness order to colleagues on the other side. As I understand it you're going to give us your witness order tomorrow, which we appreciate.

In terms of the witnesses, we understand from one of Your Honor's earlier rulings that Your Honor was looking for a

1	short, simple direct limited to a very brief
2	summary of what the witnesses talked about.
3	So our intent is to keep it less than 15
4	minutes for each of our witnesses, and they
5	get opened up for cross. Then they're subject
6	to redirect.
7	I mentioned to Mr. Carroll that it
8	would be helpful to have some sense on our
9	side of how long they intend to cross our
10	witnesses for because Mr. Furman has an event
11	on Wednesday that he's planning on going to.
12	He'll cancel it if need be, and it sounds like
13	from Mr. Carroll need will be, that we're not
14	going to get to Mr. Furman Tuesday.
15	So we will plan on calling Mr.
16	Hawkins and Dr. Singer tomorrow, and Mr.
17	Furman Wednesday, and then turning the case
18	over to Comcast at some point on Wednesday.
19	We also think let me leave it
20	at that.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: So Wednesday is
22	when Comcast's cross-examination will start?

1	MR. SCHMIDT: No, I'm sorry.
2	MR. CARROLL: That's when our
3	case-in-chief will start.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's when your
5	case-in-chief will start.
6	MR. CARROLL: That's what I
7	understand from my friends. My understanding
8	is that they're going first and
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah, they have to
10	go first.
11	MR. CARROLL: Yeah, and one of
12	their witnesses can't appear. Mr. Tagliabue
13	is unable to appear during their case. We
14	were accommodating, and we said fine. We'll
15	let you call him out of order and call him
16	during my case on Thursday.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I hear you.
18	MR. CARROLL: Because I figured it
19	would be the fairest thing to do, as long as
20	there's at least one of our witnesses who
21	still goes after him, and that's been agreed
22	to.

1	The order of the witnesses they're
2	proposing is otherwise fine with us. As to
3	their first witness, I do have one issue that
4	I wanted to raise with Your Honor when it's
5	the appropriate time to raise it.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Well, we're
7	all set on that then. That's going to be the
8	order, and 16 April, do we have a time? I
9	mean is he going to be available in the
10	morning?
11	MR. LEVY: Yes, he's been
12	available at the start of the hearing day.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, and he is
14	okay. I'm not going to ask anything more
15	about that.
16	So okay. Now, go ahead. You were
17	going to say something about Mr. Hawkins?
18	MR. CARROLL: Yeah, Mr. Hawkins,
19	Your Honor, who is their first witness, first
20	of all, they have three fact witnesses and one
21	expert. Mr. Winger is their expert.
22	MR. SCHMIDT: Dr. Singer.

1	MR. CARROLL: Doctor. We have
2	doctors, too. Fine.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. That's
4	fine.
5	MR. CARROLL: I'm focusing on the
6	fact witnesses, and none of them are doctors.
7	There are three fact witnesses:
8	Hawkins, Furman, and Tagliabue.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
10	MR. CARROLL: And our
11	understanding and they've been disclosed as
12	fact witnesses, not experts and our
13	understanding is that that means they testify
14	about things that they have some personal
15	familiarity with based on their own factual
16	involvement, and they're not going to give
17	expert opinions.
18	Now, the relevance of that to Mr.
19	Hawkins is the following. He left the NFL.
20	He's no longer employed by the NFL. He left
21	the NFL in June of 2008, opened his own
22	consulting job, and he's a paid consultant who

works for the NFL and has a consulting/expert witness.

When I look at his proposed witness testimony, he's got a mix in it now, a melange of things that come from when he was an employee of the NFL and has some knowledge of and some things that come separately that look like they're just expert opinions he wants to offer in.

I have an objection to anything in the way of an expert opinion from Mr. Hawkins. I don't think that's called for, and he should be here as a fact witness to testify about whatever he knows from the time he was an employee of the NFL.

I don't know whether that's objectionable. Hopefully, it's not from the other side, and again, there are some places in his proposed direct testimony where it sure looks to me like he's getting into expert type opinions based on information that comes after he left the NFL.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

JUDGE SIPPEL: Okav. Mr. Schmidt.

MR. LEVY: Your Honor, Mr. Hawkins is, as Mr. Carroll makes clear, is a former employee of the NFL. He is a former executive of the NFL. He was there for nearly 15 years. Virtually everything that he's going to testify about is information that was known to me or events in which he participated or he's addressing materials on which he relied in the ordinary course of business when he was there at the NFL.

If there are specific issues that Mr. Carroll has that he thinks fall into the category of expert opinion, then, you know, we're happy to hear about them, but as you'll see when you meet Mr. Hawkins tomorrow, he is very knowledgeable about the industry. That was his role at the NFL. He served as an advisor on strategic affairs, as well as a lawyer, as well as an administrator, as well as a negotiator, and what he is providing in his direct testimony, as Your Honor will see,

1	is factual information for the most part.
2	Virtually all is factual information of things
3	with which he was familiar and that he had to
4	address in his capacity as a senior NFL
5	executive who dealt with communications
6	matters.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Well, what
8	we'll do is we'll just take it one at a time.
9	You're going to have marked for identification
10	his written testimony or it has already been
11	marked in, but he's going to take the stand
12	with his written testimony, and before we
13	start then on his direct, we can maybe clear
14	that up. Is there anything specifically in
15	the direct testimony you're going to object
16	to?
17	MR. CARROLL: Yes.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: And if there's
19	something in there that looks to you like an
20	opinion, we'll take it up at that time.
21	MR. CARROLL: Okay.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: And with the

witness right on the stand, and that way he 1 2 can explain it if it's necessary, and then 3 we'll just go from that. That's fine. MR. CARROLL: 4 MR. SCHMIDT: One thing I would 5 6 ask, and I might just say this because I think 7 you had something in front of you. If you could tell us that in advance, we'd sure be 8 9 grateful for that. MR. CARROLL: Well, I don't have a 10 problem giving, for example, Paragraph 15 of 11 proposed written statement includes 12 his 13 information from December of 2008, after he left the NFL. There's no way he got personal 14 15 knowledge of that while he was 16 employee, and it relates to opinion information. He's drawing some opinion about 17 18 fact information. 19 And another paragraph that I -and there are some exhibits on the exhibit 20 list that are associated with him that all 21

post date when he left the NFL. And we can

give you those exhibits in particular. 1 2 give you an exhibit list. And then lastly, Paragraph 33 of 3 4 direct statement is a11 of this his 5 information about advertising. Му understanding is that he got all of this from 6 7 another witness who may be hearsay as well on this, from Mr. Furman, who is going to testify 8 9 about advertising, and I think he is just 10 regurgitating the Hawkins testimony 11 another witness is going to give, and again, 12 maybe an expert gets to do that, but I don't 13 think a fact witness gets to do that. 14 MR. LEVY: We will be prepared to 15 address those issues tomorrow. I don't think 16 we're going to have any real issues. 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah, okay. 18 that's fine. 19 MR. CARROLL: Okay. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: That's the best way 21 to do it, but I appreciate the heads up. Ι 22 got the numbers, the paragraph numbers, and I

1	have the testimony.
2	But I agree. In a general
3	proposition, yes, I think that certainly it's
4	going to require that he have either personal
5	knowledge of the information or some reason to
6	have received the information from a reliable
7	source, but for what purpose? I certainly
8	don't want repetitious testimony. That's not
9	what we want. If it's just repetitious
10	testimony, then I'm not interested in hearing
11	it.
12	On the other hand, if it's
13	something different, all right. Well, let's
14	find out, and we'll make the rulings.
15	And you think that we can have
16	them on and off the stand in one day; is that
17	right?
18	MR. SCHMIDT: We've said what we
19	intend to do, Your Honor.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
21	MR. SCHMIDT: This is going to be
22	very short direct. That really is up to

1	opposing counsel
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, all right.
3	MR. SCHMIDT: as to how long
4	they intend to cross.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we'll find
6	out. Obviously you can't commit to what it's
7	going to take you.
8	Now, that takes care of Tuesday,
9	Wednesday, and then you have to get your case
10	in. Are we going to be able to finish this by
11	Friday?
1	
12	MR. CARROLL: Well, we've allotted
12 13	MR. CARROLL: Well, we've allotted two days for each side for testimony, and I
13	two days for each side for testimony, and I
13 14	two days for each side for testimony, and I think the NFL is indicating we'll have the
13 14 15	two days for each side for testimony, and I think the NFL is indicating we'll have the case handed to us some time Wednesday, subject
13 14 15 16	two days for each side for testimony, and I think the NFL is indicating we'll have the case handed to us some time Wednesday, subject to Tagliabue still coming in in the middle of
13 14 15 16 17	two days for each side for testimony, and I think the NFL is indicating we'll have the case handed to us some time Wednesday, subject to Tagliabue still coming in in the middle of our case.
13 14 15 16 17	two days for each side for testimony, and I think the NFL is indicating we'll have the case handed to us some time Wednesday, subject to Tagliabue still coming in in the middle of our case. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	two days for each side for testimony, and I think the NFL is indicating we'll have the case handed to us some time Wednesday, subject to Tagliabue still coming in in the middle of our case. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah. MR. CARROLL: So I think we're on

1	you've got work to do.
2	MR. SCHMIDT: And the only reason,
3	Your Honor, that I raised the point about the
4	15 minute introductions is I think it's in the
5	parties' interest to have symmetry on that
6	issue.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm all for it.
8	MR. SCHMIDT: Okay. Thank you.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm all for it.
10	All right. I don't want to belabor anything
11	here.
12	MR. CARROLL: Well, Your Honor,
12 13	MR. CARROLL: Well, Your Honor, let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt
13	let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt
13 14	let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt just made. I think when he said symmetry what
13 14 15	let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt just made. I think when he said symmetry what he means is he's planning 15 minutes of direct
13 14 15 16	let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt just made. I think when he said symmetry what he means is he's planning 15 minutes of direct with his witnesses and he wants me to have no
13 14 15 16 17	let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt just made. I think when he said symmetry what he means is he's planning 15 minutes of direct with his witnesses and he wants me to have no more than 15 minutes direct with my witnesses.
13 14 15 16 17 18	let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt just made. I think when he said symmetry what he means is he's planning 15 minutes of direct with his witnesses and he wants me to have no more than 15 minutes direct with my witnesses. In the abstract I have no problem with that,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	let me just come back to the point Mr. Schmidt just made. I think when he said symmetry what he means is he's planning 15 minutes of direct with his witnesses and he wants me to have no more than 15 minutes direct with my witnesses. In the abstract I have no problem with that, except I go second. They put their case in

address with one or two of my witnesses in my case, and it may be more than 15 minutes, and I don't want this exchange that just happened to be abused to be invoked two days from now as a limit on the length of my direct if there's something that I need to address with one of those witnesses.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, now, thanks for bringing that to my attentions. I did not consider myself to be ruling on a clock in the context. I am just looking to see, I'm just looking for you to give me an idea of what to expect, and you did. You said, you know -- now, whether or not it's 15 minutes for you and 20 to 30 minutes for you, whatever. I'm just interested in getting the case finished by Friday.

MR. SCHMIDT: And that's all we're interested in, too, Your Honor. We wouldn't want to be in a position where we just don't have time to conduct the scope of cross examination we want to conduct because I don't

1 understand Mr. Carroll to be saying this. 2 I think it's a moot point, but if they wanted 3 to walk through in detail with every one of their witnesses to go back to testimony, that 4 5 would eat up a lot of time. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's not 6 7 going to happen. 8 MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you, sir. 9 That's not going to JUDGE SIPPEL: 10 know, these general happen. But, you assumptions of everything is going to 11 12 smooth, I made a very simple -- my goal is a 13 simple request, you know, for a glossary of terms, and I should have done it differently 14 15 because it. turns into almost now 16 argumentative piece. I'm not criticizing 17 Now, It's a natural thing, but I want to point out 18 19 I'm going to require this, that when you 20 submit proposed findings, and I'm not sure if that would be the -- yes, when you submit 21

I want

а

findings,

proposed

22

stipulated

glossary of terms so that if I'm using terms like, you know, whatever it might be, a la carte or something like that, that I'm using a concept that everybody is on the same page with.

But, again, I'm not criticizing what you did for me. I understand what's been done, and it's helpful. At least it gives me an idea as to what the parties are thinking, and that's important. So we'll straighten that out, but it's hard to say that what's good for the goose is always good for the gander, but we'll do that. To the extent that we can do it, we'll apply that principle.

Now, is there anything else?

I appreciate your patience. This is an excellent job on a very complicated document day. I'm very pleased the way it went, and we'll see each other tomorrow then at 9:00 a.m., correct? Nine, thirty a.m., I'm sorry, 9:30 a.m., and we'll start with -- now, the witnesses are going to be coming from out

1	of town, I take it.
2	MR. LEVY: Most of them, yes.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Because I want to
4	accommodate them, particularly when we get
5	towards the afternoon. If we have 30 minutes
6	to finish somebody I'm not going to cut it off
7	so that he can fly out tomorrow night.
8	MR. LEVY: Good. thank you.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: On the other hand,
10	you know, I don't want to drag it out till
11	nine o'clock at night.
12	So okay. This is a good start.
13	So let's see what happens tomorrow morning.
14	Thank you very much.
15	PARTICIPANTS: Thank you, Your
16	Honor.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: We are in recess
18	until 9:30 tomorrow.
19	(Whereupon, at 1:17 p.m., the
20	above-entitled matter was adjourned, to
21	reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, April 14,
22	2009.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

NFL v Comcast	
Name of Hearing	
MB DOCKET NO. 08-214	1
Docket No. (if appl:	icable)
445 12 th STREET, S.W	., WASHINGTON, D.C.
Place of Hearing	
April 13, 2009	
Date of Hearing	
numbers 314 through complete transcript Katherine Sylat the above identify provisions of the cuprofessional verbat: Work and have verifit transcript by (1) coupled the reporting or recomparing the final	do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, 447, inclusive, are the true, accurate and prepared from the reporting by cora
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Reporter
Date	Name of Company: Neal Gross Co.
April 13, 2009	Mary Jo Mitchell ara of the
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber Name of Company:Neal Gross Co
April 13, 2009	Tracy Cain Vacy Cain
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Proofreader Name of Company:Neal Gross Co